

OCT 19 1927

The Classical Weekly

JOURNAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
DIV. OF MICH.

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of
March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXI, No. 2

MONDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1927

WHOLE No. 559

St. Louis

awards an adoption to the

ULLMAN & HENRY Latin Books

For use in all the High Schools of the
city, after a year of scientific study of
textbooks by a committee of teachers

ELEMENTARY LATIN \$1.40

SECOND LATIN BOOK \$1.68

With correlated studies in Latin and English

By B. L. Ullman
and Norman E. Henry

"Prepared with all the resources available in modern book-making and illustration".

"The illustrations are taken from the latest excavations as well as from the best
other sources and make a very attractive feature of the book".

"Copious illustrations presenting phases of Roman life and history that cannot fail
to be interesting and instructive".

"The book feels right in the hand and is light in the hand. . . . And yet, with all
the reading, and its compact size, it boasts a wealth of photographs modern
with the touch of the movie".

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York Boston Chicago Dallas Atlanta San Francisco

STRONG POINTS OF PLACE'S SECOND YEAR LATIN

The Introductory Lessons

Short grammar reviews and easy readings which introduce the pupil to Caesar.

The Training Camp

Intensive study of Chapters I-XX of Book I which develop the pupil's ability to read Latin easily.

The Latin Composition

An integral part of the training method rather than another subject.

The Caesar Narrative

Reading which is an equivalent of the traditional Books I-IV but selected for its significance and usability.

The Supplementary Material

Interpretative notes with questions; a complete digest of Latin syntax and inflections; vocabulary.

568 pages

Illustrated

Price, \$1.68

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

An Event of Importance

The HARVARD TESTS in LATIN VOCABULARY

are now available for you. Here are five separate tests to measure the number of Latin words that secondary-school pupils know - - Forms A, B, C, D, and E, with thirty copies to a form. What an opportunity to strengthen your course materially at a very low price per pupil!

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXI, No. 2

MONDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1927

WHOLE No. 559

THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY Twenty-two Recent Additions

(Continued from page 3)

(4) Demosthenes De Corona and De Falsa Legatione. By C. A. Vince, Formerly Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and J. H. Vince, Formerly Scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge (1926). Pp. v + 479.

There are separate Introductions to the two speeches included in the volume of Demosthenes which is under notice here (3-17, 232-245). Each Introduction deals with the date of the speech, sets forth the circumstances under which it was delivered, and seeks to paint the historical background. There is an outline of each speech (neither outline is adequate). In neither part of the book is any bibliographical information given, at least in formal, concentrated fashion.

(5) Epictetus. The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual, and Fragments. Volume I (the first of two volumes). By W. A. Oldfather, of the University of Illinois (1926). Pp. xxxviii + 443.

The Introduction of Professor Oldfather's volume on Epictetus (vii-xxvii) deals with Epictetus (vii-xii), the Discourses (xii-xvi), the personality of Epictetus (xvi-xx), his teachings (xx-xxvii), his influence and his value (xxvii-xxx). There is also a Bibliography (xxxi-xxxvii). The volume contains, too, text and translation of Books I-II of the Discourses, and an Index <Nominum et Rerum> (437-443).

On page xxvi Professor Oldfather rejects the view, often urged, that Epictetus was influenced by the writings of the New Testament.

...Of course Epictetus knew about the existence of Christians, to whom he twice refers, calling them once Jews (II. 9, 19 ff.), and a second time Galilaeans (IV. 7, 6), for there was an early community at Nicopolis (Paul's Epistle to Titus, iii. 12), but he shared clearly in the vulgar prejudices against them, and his general intolerance of variant opinion, even when for conscience's sake, makes it certain that he would never have bothered to read their literature. The linguistic resemblances, which are occasionally striking, like "Lord, have mercy!" *κύριε, ἐλέησον*, are only accidental, because Epictetus was speaking the common language of ethical exhortation in which the evangelists and apostles wrote; while the few specious similarities are counterbalanced by as many striking differences....

(6) Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History. Volume I (the first of two volumes). By Kirsopp Lake, "Winn Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Harvard" <sic/> (1926). Pp. lvi + 525.

The Introduction (ix-lvi) deals with I. The Life and Writings of Eusebius (ix-xxvii), II. The Manuscripts of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* (xxvii-xxx), III. The Printed Text of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* (xxx-xxxiii), IV. The Plan of Eusebius in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* and the Sources which he Used (xxxiii-lvi). There is no Bibliography, no Index. Text and trans-

lation of Books I-V of the History are given. The discussion of the sources, book by book, is minute (xxxv-lvi).

I quote parts of the opening paragraphs of the discussion of the plan which Eusebius followed in his work (xxxiii-xxxv).

The general plan of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* is clear and lucid. The chronology adopted is that of the Roman Emperors, and the events are arranged reign by reign. But there is little or no attempt to give any closer dating than this, and the relation between events during the same reign is not indicated. To this there is one exception. The bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem are given, and in the case of Rome and Alexandria the exact dates are given....

One further observation is necessary. The object of the whole book was to present the Christian "Succession", which did not merely mean, though it certainly included, the apostolic succession of the bishops of the four great "thrones", but rather the whole intellectual, spiritual, and institutional life of the Church. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that Eusebius, like all early church historians, can be understood only if it be recognized that whereas modern writers try to trace the development, growth, and change of doctrines and institutions, their predecessors were trying to prove that nothing of the kind ever happened. According to them the Church had had one and only one teaching from the beginning; it had been preserved by the "Succession" and heresy was the attempt of the Devil to change it.

It will be well worth the reader's while to see what is said of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius by a highly competent authority, Professor James T. Shotwell, of the Department of History of Columbia University. His complimentary account of the work is to be found in a volume entitled *An Introduction to the History of History* (part of the series called *Records of Civilization*), 308-312 (Columbia University Press, 1922. See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.203-205).

Within a year of the publication of Professor Lake's translation of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius another version of the History appeared, in the first volume of a work bearing the title *Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea, The Ecclesiastical History and The Martyrs of Palestine*, Translated with Introduction and Notes, by Hugh Jackson Lawlor and John Ernest Leonard Oulton (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927. Pp. xvi + 402). The first volume, labelled only Translation, contains also a brief Preface (v-vi), and a list of Abbreviations and Editions Used (vii-xv).

I give now Professor Lake's version of the opening of Eusebius's Preface:

I have purposed to record in writing the successions of the sacred apostles, covering the period stretching from our Saviour to ourselves; the number and character of the transactions recorded in the history of the Church; the number of those who were distinguished in her government and leadership in the provinces of

greatest fame; the number of those who in each generation were the ambassadors of the word of God either by speech or pen; the names, the number and the age of those who, driven by the desire of innovation to an extremity of error, have heralded themselves as the introducers of Knowledge, falsely so-called, ravaging the flock of Christ unsparingly, like grim wolves. To this I will add the fate which has beset the whole nation of the Jews from the moment of their plot against our Saviour; moreover, the number and nature and times of the wars waged by the heathen against the divine word and the character of those who, for its sake, passed from time to time through the contest of blood and torture; furthermore the martyrdoms of our own time, and the gracious and favouring help of our Saviour in them all. My starting-point is therefore no other than the first dispensation of God touching our Saviour and Lord, Jesus the Christ....

In the work by Messrs. Lawlor and Oulton the translation was made by Mr. Oulton; Mr. Lawlor is preparing the Introduction and Notes which are to comprise Volume 2. I give Mr. Oulton's version of the passage considered above:

The successions from the holy apostles, together with the times that have elapsed from our Saviour's day down to our own; the important affairs that are said to have been transacted in the history of the Church, and those who took a prominent place in that history as leaders and presidents in such communities as were especially famous; those who in each generation were ambassadors of the divine word, either orally or by means of treatises also; the names, number and times of all those who through love of innovation fell into the most grievous error, and have proclaimed themselves as introducers of knowledge falsely so called, unsparingly like *grievous wolves* ravaging the flock of Christ; the disasters, moreover, that fell upon the whole Jewish nation immediately after their plot against our Saviour; as also the extent, nature and times of the war which has been waged by the heathen against the divine word, and the noble men who as occasion offered endured death and torture in the conflict on its behalf; the martyrdoms, after these things, that took place in our day also, and the gracious and kindly succour of our Saviour at the end of all: these it is my purpose to commit to writing, yet my starting-point shall be none other than the beginning of the dispensation of Jesus, our Saviour and Lord, the Christ the Lord.

Mr. Oulton had not seen Professor Lake's version. Both Professor Lake and Mr. Oulton knew, and used, the version by Professor C. W. McGiffert, of the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, which forms pages 81-403 of Volume 1 of *The Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series*.

It may be noted, finally, that in the matter of form Mr. Oulton's book has an advantage over Professor Lake's, in that the translation is broken up into short paragraphs. One paragraph in Professor Lake's book, in his translation of Book 1, runs to nearly five pages. Mr. Oulton also sets in the body of the page captions meant to summarize contents. I am inclined to think that these belong rather on the margins.

(7) Hippocrates. Volume III. By "Dr. E. T. Withington" <of Balliol College> (1927). Pp. xxvii + 455.

The first two volumes of *The Loeb Classical Library* translation of Hippocrates, by W. H. S. Jones, were noticed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 17.177. In a brief Preface (viii) to the present volume, Professor

Jones explains that this volume has "been entrusted to Dr. E. T. Withington, of Balliol College. Only a trained surgeon can explain the surgical treatises of the Hippocratic Collection".

The volume contains a Translator's Preface (v-vii), Preface (viii), General Introduction (xi-xxvii), text and translation of several treatises (*On Wounds in the Head*, 1-51; *In the Surgery*, 53-81; *Fractures, Joints, Mochlicon* <= *Instruments of Reduction*>, 84-449), and Appendix: Supplementary Note <s> (451-454). To each treatise a special Introduction is prefixed (2-5, 52-57, 84-93). There is no Bibliography, no Index.

The General Introduction contains a history of surgery among the Greeks and the Romans (xi-xxii), with a special discussion of bandages (xix-xx), ointments (xx-xxi), and splints (xxi-xxii), a brief discussion of the parts of the Hippocratic Corpus included in this volume (xxiii-xxv), and an account of Manuscripts, Editions, and Commentaries (xxvi-xxvii).

There are several illustrations. One, the frontispiece, is a reproduction of an illustration of "the shouldering method of reducing the shoulder joint", found in the Manuscript, B. This, Dr. Withington thinks, is a "fairly accurate copy" of an ancient original, made by Apollonius (a surgeon whom Dr. Withington places about 75 B. C.), or by "the artist he employed" (vii). Another illustration, opposite page 454, gives two attempts, by Vidius (1544) and Littre (1844), to reproduce the Hippocratic Bench, used in cases of dislocation of the thigh. Dr. Withington makes some original suggestions in connection with this Bench.

(8) Josephus. Volume I (the first of eight volumes). By H. St. J. Thackeray (1926). Pp. xx + 425.

The volume on Josephus contains an Introduction (vii-xx), *The Life of Josephus* <by himself>, text and translation (1-159); *Against Apion*, or *On the Antiquity of the Jews*, text and translation (162-411); Index I. General <of Names and Subjects> (413-423); Index II. Biblical Passages <used by Josephus> (424-425). The Introduction deals with the Life <of Josephus> (vii-xi), *The Major Works* <of Josephus> (xi-xii), *The Minor Works* (xii-xvi), MSS. and Other Ancient Authorities for the Greek Text (xvii-xix), Recent Editions of the Greek Text (xix), Other Works (xix), Abbreviations (xx). No English translation of these parts of Josephus is named.

In connection with Josephus's Autobiography, the reader should consult a valuable article, *Three Ancient Autobiographies*, by Charles J. Goodwin, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 17.130-135 (see especially pages 131-133).

A sample of the translation may be given, from the version of the Life, §§ 340-344.

How then, Justus—if I may address him as though he were present—how, most clever of historians, as you boast yourself to be, can I and the Galilaeans be held responsible for the insurrection of your native city against the Romans and against the king; seeing that, before I was elected by the general assembly at Jerusalem to the command of Galilee, you and all the citizens of Tiberias had not only resorted to arms, but were

actually at war with the towns of the Syrian Decapolis? It was you who burnt their villages, and your domestic fell in the engagement on that occasion. This is no unsupported assertion of my own. The facts are recorded in the *Commentaries* of the Emperor Vespasian, which further relate how insistently the inhabitants of Decapolis pressed Vespasian, when at Ptolemais, to punish you, as the culprit. And punished you would have been under his orders, had not King Agrippa, though empowered to put you to death, at the urgent entreaty of his sister Berenice, commuted the death penalty to a long term of imprisonment. Moreover, your subsequent public life is a sure index of character and proves that it was you who caused the revolt of your native city from Rome. Proofs of these statements I shall adduce presently.

(9) Pausanias. Volume II (the second of six volumes). By W. H. S. Jones, of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, and H. A. Ormerod, the University, Leeds (1926). Pp. v + 551.

The second volume of the translation of Pausanias contains Books III-V of Pausanias, dealing respectively with Laconia, Messenia, and Elis. The translation of Book III, Chapters 1-22, and Book V, is the work of Professor Jones; that of Book III, Chapter 23 to the end of Book IV was prepared by Professor Ormerod. There is no Index.

For a notice of Volume I see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13.153-154.

(10-11) Plato, The Laws. Two Volumes. By R. G. Bury, Formerly Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge (1926). Pp. xvii + 501; 580.

In volume I of the translation of Plato's Laws will be found text and translation of Books I-VI, in volume 2 text and translation of Books VII-XII.

The Introduction (Volume I, vii-xvii) deals with the date of the Laws (vii), an analysis of the work, book by book, but without indication of the limits of the divisions (vii-xii), some discussion of the Contents of the Laws (xii-xvii), and ten lines of bibliographical matter (xvii). In 2.571-582 there is an Index <of Names and Subjects>.

Professor Bury describes (I.vii) the Laws as the work of Plato's old age:

According to tradition, Plato was born in 427 B. C. and died in 347 B. C., leaving behind him as his last work the *Laws*. We may, therefore, suppose that the last decade of his life was mainly occupied with its composition. The internal evidence of the work itself sufficiently confirms tradition. Not only does it lack the charm and vigour of the earlier dialogues, but it is marked also by much uncouthness of style, and by a tendency to pedantry, tautology and discursive garrulity which seems to point to the failing powers of the author. Moreover, the author himself indicates his own advanced age by the artistic device of representing the three interlocutors in the dialogue as old men, and by the stress he repeatedly lays upon the fact of their age, as well as upon the reverence due from the young to the old.

Of the contents of the work Professor Bury writes thus (I.xii-xiii):

It will be clear from this analysis that the title of *Laws* is a very insufficient—not to say misleading—description of its contents. Barely one-third of the work consists of "laws" in the literal sense of the term; the rest is a far-ranging discussion of all that concerns the life of man as a "political animal". Human nature

in general is the main theme of the latter part of Book I, Book II, and large sections of Books V and VII; while the earlier part of Book I, Book III, and Book IV have for their main theme human nature in its social and civic aspect....

(To be continued)

CHARLES KNAPP

THE END, AND THE BEGINNING, OF PLATO'S PHAEDO

The last sentence of Plato's *Phaedo* runs as follows:

"Ἦδε ἡ τελευτή, ὃ Ἐχέκρατες, τοῦ ἐταίρου ἡμῶν ἐγένετο, ἀνδρὸς, ὡς ἡμεῖς φαίμεν ἂν, τῶν τότε ὡν ἐπειράθημεν ἀρίστου καὶ ἀλλως φρονιμωτάτου καὶ δικαιοτάτου¹."

Is there any reason why, in an English translation of the *Phaedo*, the very last word to fall on the ear should not be, as in the Greek original, the word by which Plato, through the mouth of *Phaedo*, gently proclaims to impartial judges, in his time and in all future times, that Socrates was most *just*? The words 'justice' and 'injustice' stirred the depths of Plato's soul. The unrighteous men who had charged Socrates with unrighteousness and had condemned him to death are always in his mind; their crime had darkened all his life. His grief and indignation are seen in the *Apology* and in the *Gorgias*, and find an echo in some words attributed to 'those who praise injustice above justice' in a well-known passage about that Ideal Commonwealth which itself springs from the search for a kingdom wherein dwelleth Righteousness (*Republic* 361 E, in Jowett's translation): "The just man who is thought unjust will be scourged, racked, bound—will have his eyes burnt out; and, at last, after suffering every kind of evil, he will be impaled: then he will understand that he ought to seem only, and not to be, just".

Jowett's rendering of the final sentence of the *Phaedo* is as follows: "Such was the end, Echecrates, of our friend; concerning whom I may truly say, that of all the men of his time whom I have known, he was the wisest and justest and best". The literary beauty of Jowett's translation of Plato is so great, more especially in the concluding pages of the *Phaedo*, that one hesitates to lay hands on what is, in its own way, a classic. Nevertheless I would suggest that a closer, and no lengthier, version of the narrator's concluding words would be, 'This was the end, Echecrates, of our companion, a man who, among those of his day whom we have known, was—we may say—the best, the wisest too, and the most just'. Like the *Crown* of Demosthenes, the *Phaedo* of Plato ends with an adjective—an adjective which is charged with deep meaning. That adjective should be kept where Plato placed it. It is the same word as is found in a great sentence of the *Theaetetus* (176 C), where it will be translated more appropriately by 'righteous': 'God is righteous to the uttermost; and there is nothing more like God than he among us who is righteous to the full'.

¹Other Greek passages discussed in this paper are readily accessible, in the Loeb Classical Library, and elsewhere. It is better that they should be read in their original setting than that they should be printed here as detached extracts.

Without some loss of that quiet simplicity and homely brevity which the Greeks looked for at the close of a tragedy (the *Phaedo* is a tragedy in prose), the full meaning of the final Greek sentence cannot be given in another tongue; the words, to be really known, must be studied as they stand in the Greek text, where, surely, we have them, modern sceptics notwithstanding, in the exact form in which they first came from Plato's hand and heart. But we must be as faithful as we can. For example, we must follow the Greek in saying not 'I', but 'we', that is, *Phaedo* and the other disciples of Socrates. We should also retain (as being no mere unemphatic verbal prop to carry the sentence along) the expression 'a *man* who' as and where it comes in the Greek, for the word employed is the distinctive Greek word for a man who is a man and not simply a human being². We turn instinctively to Shakespeare, and feel that *Phaedo*, Plato, and their fellow-disciples are ready "to say to all the world, 'This was a man!'" But Shakespeare also reminds us that "Truth hath a quiet breast", and we notice how carefully and sincerely in the midst of his own and *Phaedo*'s deep emotion Plato has saved the concluding superlatives from any seeming extravagance by speaking of 'the men of that day whom we have actually known'. We cannot agree with certain Dutch and German scholars that Plato should have written 'of all the men that ever lived'. It is a Shakespearian master of high-pitched rhetoric who says of the dead Caesar, "Thou art the ruins of the noblest man That ever lived in the tide of times".

We must also be careful, in however concise a translation, not to omit the word *ἄλλως*, 'besides', which Plato not infrequently adds (as here) to *καί*. The addition may seem heavy and superfluous, but it is neither the one nor the other. With its Homeric associations, it makes the closing clause not only more explicit but more impressive: 'and withal', or 'yea, and', would be a suitable rendering for an expression that has an archaic, and (so to say) a scriptural, ring. The expression occurs in the Homeric Poems nearly a score of times; the nearest parallel to its meaning here is supplied, perhaps, by *Iliad* 20.99³. As Plato ends the great dialogue on the immortality of the soul and the wonderful description of the last hours of Socrates, he wishes not to speak vaguely of the goodness of a man who had died a hero's death, but to ascribe to him also the homely everyday specific virtues of prudence and fair-dealing. Both in substance and in form, the conclusion of the *Phaedo* should be compared not only with the last sentence in Section 114 C of the *Phaedo* itself, but with the concluding clause in the last sentence but one of the *Gorgias*.

It is apt to escape notice that, in this final sentence, there is hardly a word or a phrase which is un-Homeric. Even the proper name *Echecrates* would not sound strange in Homer's time, since both the verb and

the noun of which it is compounded are common enough in the oldest Greek we know. The adjective *φρόνιμος*, which suggests 'sagacity', 'practical wisdom', 'prudence', is not itself found in the Homeric Poems, but closely related words are, so that it would have been easily understood by any intelligent person of that age or of any age; and this is true of all the diction of the sentence. The Greek expressions here translated by 'whom we have known' (more literally, 'have made trial of') and by 'those of his day' might well seem, even to a Greek scholar, eminently Attic and prosaic, but they are Homeric right enough. The word for 'end' (or, more exactly, 'completion') might also seem a prose word entirely. It is not; it has Homeric associations, and those of the right sort. Homer's *βίοτῳ τελευτῇ* is suggested, not his *τέλος θανάτῳ*. The latter, far more than the former, might have implied that it was possible to 'bury Socrates' (compare *Phaedo* 115 E). The superlative of *δίκαιος* might appear quite unmanageable in the Homeric hexameter. Yet it occurs in *Iliad* 13.64, where mention is made of a race, hardly known otherwise, called the *Abioi*, who are described 'as a most just people' (*δικαιοτάτων ἀνθρώπων*), a race whom we may rank in our minds with that *Ripheus* who, in *Aeneid* 2.426-427, is said to have been 'the one most just, the most careful of right, of all men in Troy'—*iustissimus unus qui fuit in Teucris et servantissimus aequi*...

It is distressing to think that, from the still and solemn cadence which concludes one of the greatest pieces of prose music, and one of the most ennobling narratives, in all literature, scholars of mark should have proposed to cut out this word or that⁴, thus marring alike the music and the sense. Let us take one instance only. So excellent an editor as Martin Schanz would omit *ἄλλως* (which Jowett has left untranslated) from the text itself. In the General Preface to his critical edition of Plato, Schanz describes the brackets which he is in the habit of employing as "uncos nemini noxios". If, when used thus lavishly, they 'do no harm to anybody', then must everybody be strangely blind to the beauty of Plato's way of thinking and writing. With no less blindness, some scholars will confidently attribute to Plato the unhappy, and unashamed, imitation of this passage in the Platonic Epistle 7 (324 D). A lover of Plato who compares the two passages word by word can only think with regard to the version in the Epistles, 'Did Plato say so? Then the less Plato he'. But, however this may be, there can be no manner of doubt that, at the end of the *Phaedo*, the ear demands the breaking of the procession of adjectives, while the mind asks for the addition of 'withal', 'in particular'.

In the concluding sentence of the *Phaedo*, though other words are also full of meaning, special emphasis falls on the final word. So with the opening sentence of the dialogue, except that there the word most stressed is that which, like some keynote, strikes

² *ὁ ἀνὴρ* is used near the beginning of the dialogue. The implication is, perhaps, that Socrates was a man first and last.

³ Compare *Odyssey* 6.84. *καὶ... ἄλλαι* there seems to give the key to the meaning of *καὶ ἄλλως*.

⁴ See also *Iliad* 11.832, Homeric Hymns 8.5.

⁵ One editor would actually omit all the words from *ἀνδρός* to *δικαιοτάτου*!

the ear first of all. Here, however, English idiom, with its poverty of inflections, forbids the retention of the Greek order. We simply cannot, without obscurity and grotesqueness, say, 'Self, Phaedo, were you yourself at Socrates's side on that memorable day when he drank the poison in the prison-house, or did you hear it from another?' 'Self, Echecrates'. Yet the placing of 'Self' at the very beginning of both question and answer is most expressive and dramatic. This was felt by the Greeks themselves. Athenaeus, near the beginning of his 'Professors at Dinner' (1.3), speaks of himself as 'dramatizing' his dialogue in emulation of Plato, and promptly copies Plato's placing and repetition of 'Self'. Again, the rhetorician Hermogenes says, with some measure of truth (as will be felt by anybody who reads the two sentences aloud), that, in the question, the word 'Self' implies Echecrates's admiration for Phaedo as a man who had been with Socrates to the end, while Phaedo's reply expresses a natural pride of his own. The real explanation is more substantial. At the very outset, Plato wishes it to be understood that the last scene and the last discussion are about to be described by an eye-witness and an ear-witness. He had been absent from the death-scene himself, and it is of prime importance for his readers to know that they are listening to an authentic narrative from one who had himself seen and heard.

Why had Plato been absent?

It is well known that Aristotle, in the entire *corpus* of his genuine remains, never introduces his own name. Plato, in his Dialogues (as distinguished from the Letters attributed to him), mentions himself three times only, though the names of his brothers Glaucon and Adeimantus are much to the fore. But those three occasions are the more significant for their very infrequency. Two of the passages are in the Apology (34 A, 38 B): they make it clear that 'Plato yonder' and 'Plato here' was present in court during the trial of Socrates and ready to share with others in the payment of a fine larger than his teacher, unassisted, could have met. The third passage comes in one of the opening sections of the Phaedo (59 B).

Plato, who writes the dialogue, makes Socrates's young and much loved disciple Phaedo, who narrates it and describes the whole scene to Echecrates at Phlius, allude in the fewest possible words to his absence, and give the reason for it: 'Plato, I think, was ill'. Present at the trial, Plato had, therefore, been absent a month later at the closing scene of all. The absence must have meant much to him, but, with characteristic reserve, he makes little of it; and that little, with its almost casual tone, is dramatically appropriate in the mouth of Phaedo, who was not an Athenian, and therefore not the right man to speak positively about the cause. The mention of the fact that Plato was not there throws into relief the express statement, at the very beginning, that Phaedo *was* there in person; it may also convey a hint that there is much of Plato, as well as of Socrates, in the reported discussion of the immortality of the soul, eye-witness and ear-witness though Phaedo may be.

One sometimes wonders whether the word (*ἡσθένει*) translated by 'was ill' is not to be taken in the literal sense, 'had not the strength', thus implying that Plato, who at the time would be twenty-eight years of age, feared that he could not stand it, that, like Apollodorus and 'the women' (Phaedo 117 D), he might break down, and was thus kept away by a very 'human weakness' (*ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἀσθένεια*: Phaedo 107 A; compare Laws 854 A)⁶. That the grief of Plato at the death of Socrates was great and memorable is shown by a reference made to it, centuries afterwards, by Plutarch (De Virtute Morali 449 E).

Be all this as it may, the safest translation of *ἡσθένει* will be 'was ill', or 'was unwell', for such a rendering will, as the Greek does, leave it undetermined whether the illness was a sickness of sorrow or some physical malady. The verb and its related noun and adjective cover much ground in Plato's writings, but the terms chiefly suggest ailments of the body. At the beginning of the Timaeus, *ἀσθενεία τις* is, most naturally, understood to be a bodily illness, and the man who 'would not willingly have been absent from this gathering' was, it has sometimes been conjectured, Plato himself. It is to be noticed, too, that an unidentified Greek writer, in paraphrasing, at some later date, the passage of the Phaedo, substitutes *ἐνδύει* for *ἡσθένει*. Further, in the Greek medical writings *ὁ νοσῶν*, *ὁ κάμνων*, and *ὁ ἀσθενῶν* are all commonly used of 'the patient' (whatever the disease may be), but *νοσῶ* and *κάμνω* are mostly used of severe illness, *ἀσθενῶ* and *ἀρρωστῶ* of less severe illness. There are, however, many exceptions. Thus, at the beginning of Xenophon's Anabasis *ἡσθένει* plainly means that Darius's strength was almost exhausted, that it was ebbing away, and his end was drawing near.

Plato, then, was absent through some kind of *ἀσθένεια*. Were there, among the friends of Socrates, any others whose absence was noteworthy? Though, in an enumeration which does not profess to be complete, Plato does not record the fact, Xenophon was not there. He had not yet come back from his expedition with the Ten Thousand. Towards the end of the Memorabilia, after stating that it was admitted that in all recorded time no man yet had met death more nobly than Socrates, Xenophon quotes 'Hermogenes, the son of Hipponicus', as his authority for some details (presumably gleaned after his return from the East) of the last days and talks of Socrates. This Hermogenes was one of the nine Athenians who are specified by Plato as having been with Socrates when he died. Besides the Athenian 'natives', other friends were present from a distance—from Thebes, Megara, Elis. Plato notes two absences other than his own. Echecrates asks, 'But further: Aristippus and Cleombrotus—were they present?' Phaedo replies, 'No, not

⁶The notion of nerve-weakness is prominent in a passage (365 A) near the beginning of the Axiochus, preserved among the Platonic writings: *καταλαμβάνομεν αὐτὸν... τῷ σώματι ῥωμαλέον, ἀσθενή δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν, πάντῃ ἐνδεὰ παραμυθίας*. Neurasthenia is, it may be added, a comparatively modern word.

⁷It is unfortunate that Cobet, who is followed by other editors, should have inserted *οὐ* before *παρεγένοντο*. As so often in Greek (compare *ἐν Ἀγίῳ* in the next sentence), emphasis falls on the words that come early in the clause.

they; they were said to be *in Aegina*'. The expression 'were said' is cautious, as the phrase 'I think' was; but in neither case must we suppose that Plato, as contrasted with his narrator, was in any doubt as to the facts. The best commentary on this passage is furnished by an author little known, Demetrius, in his *De Elocutione*, § 288*:

Good taste is shown in the *Phaedo*, where Plato desires to reproach Aristippus and Cleombrotus because they were feasting at Aegina when Socrates was lying for many days imprisoned at Athens, and did not cross to visit their friend and master, although they were less than twenty-five miles from Athens. He has not said all this in express terms (for that would have been an open reproach), but with fitting tact as follows. Phaedo is asked who were with Socrates. He enumerates the men one by one. Next he is asked whether Aristippus too and Cleombrotus were present. "No", he answers, "they were in Aegina". Everything that precedes owes its point to the words "they were in Aegina". The passage seems far more effective because the effect is produced by the fact itself and not by an explicit statement by the speaker.

The explanation offered by Phaedo for the absence of the easy-going Cyrenaic Aristippus and his companion Cleombrotus is, in fact, ironical. Aegina was so near Athens that Pericles could call it 'the eyesore of the Peiraeus' (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.10). The 'crossing' (Aristophanes, *Vespae* 122), with its two-obol fare (Plato, *Gorgias* 511 D), could not be compared with the big tract of land and sea which, as we have seen, had kept Xenophon away from his master's side. Not only that: Aegina was the home of Laïs, and was famous for its 'good living'. It is as if the scene of Socrates's execution had been Liverpool and the reason for the absence of two pleasure-lovers among his followers was that they were holiday-making in the Isle of Man or in Anglesey! Or, more nearly, that they would not cross from Dover to Calais, or from Calais to Dover! In his interpretation of the passage Demetrius (a Peripatetic) is no doubt reproducing a tradition, true or false, of the philosophical schools. This may be inferred from certain passages, more or less parallel, in Diogenes Laertius (2.65; 3.36) and in Athenaeus (544 D; 588 E).

If Plato here seems too hard on Aristippus, we have to remember that Aristippus, on his part, could sometimes rebuke Plato in a rather cutting way. Compare Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.23: 'Aristippus said in reply to Plato when the latter spoke too professorially, as he thought, "Well, anyhow, our friend <Socrates> never spoke like that"'. Yet the same Aristippus, when he was asked how Socrates had died, is reported to have answered, 'As I would fain die' (see Diogenes Laertius 2.76). Absent though he must have been, he had heard the great tale, and had joined in the general admiration.

Let us now return, in conclusion, to the last sentence of the *Phaedo* and its final word. No translation of this or of any other Greek sentence can be wholly adequate. Sense, sound, rhythm, and order make a Greek sentence

what it is; they are interwoven, and form an artistic whole. Of the twenty-four Greek words here used there are (as will have been seen incidentally) few indeed which will not make a translator hesitate between one possible equivalent and another, and feel with regret that complete exactitude must be sacrificed to simplicity and general effect. Should he, for instance, say 'friend', or 'bosom-friend', 'companion', 'comrade', 'mate'?

One object of the present paper, in which Greek words have been introduced sparingly that it may appeal to non-Grecians as well as Grecians, is to urge readers of mature age to secure for the younger generation a better school education in Greek than they themselves have had. The writer's life has been spent in the task of seeking for Greek studies the place they merit in the new Universities of Great Britain. There has been much to encourage him where he has worked, but he has often had cause to regret that his pupils had not had an earlier start in the Greek language. Many of them were intending to become Christian ministers; given an earlier start in Greek, they would have been able to expound their Sacred Books with greater confidence and authority. The *Phaedo* also is one of the world's Sacred Books. It is part of that large collection of Plato's writings which by happy fortune seems to have come to us in its integrity, without any loss whatsoever, and may well claim the study of a lifetime. In the *Apology*, the *Crito*, and the *Phaedo*, the trial, defense, condemnation, imprisonment, last utterances, and death of the great teacher Socrates are described by his great pupil Plato. Plato was under thirty when Socrates drank the hemlock; the fifty years he had yet to live were to be dedicated to the vindication—the *justification*—of his dead hero. The miscarriage of justice in an Athenian law court was to lead to the exaltation of justice before the great tribunal of the human race. That homely figure⁹—so truth-loving, so selfdisciplined, so brave, so kindly, so humorous—has become a pattern of righteousness for all mankind, and this chiefly through Plato, for he himself left behind him not a single written word. No pains, then, spent on Plato's least turn of language will seem to the scholar wasted, nor will he ever forget that the writings of Plato, like those of other Greek poets and prose authors, are meant for the ear (not simply for the eye), and that their sound is part of their sense.

The weakness of Jowett's rendering of this sentence is not in the sound (he is a fine writer of harmonious English), but in the sense; he fails to give the scrupulous, resolute truthfulness of the original with its studied and repeated qualifications guarding against the least overstatement, and to place the tribute to Socrates's justice right at the very end, as Plato has done¹⁰. It may be that Jowett, or the pupils (the *ἐταῖροι*) who helped him, thought, as many earlier students had thought, that the last sentence of the great dialogue was rather flat, and did not really count.

*Demetrius (text and translation) is now accessible in a volume of the Loeb Classical Library, which contains a version of Aristotle, Poetics, and "Longinus" On the Sublime, by W. Hamilton Fyfe, and Demetrius on Style, by W. Rhys Roberts (1927). From that volume the above translation is taken.

⁹Small, but powerful, as seen in the remarkable statuette recently acquired by the British Museum.

¹⁰Compare Herodotus 8.79 (of Aristides), *ἀριστον ἀνδρα γενέσθαι ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι καὶ δίκαιότατον*.

This would be a grave delusion. Though the Greeks loved to end quietly, they wished their endings to be full of meaning. An old commentator once maintained, in a Latin note, that the reason why the last five lines of the Bacchae of Euripides are word for word the same as those that finish four earlier plays of the same poet is simply that, at the end of a drama, the noise made by the departing audience was so great that it was useless to take trouble over the conclusion! Far rather was it a case of *δὲς ἢ τρὶς τὰ καλὰ*—things well said can, and should, be repeated as they stand. In that wonderful play of his old age, Euripides—we may be sure—meant much by the first of his five concluding lines, *πολλὰ μορφαὶ τῶν δαιμονίων*, 'Many are the shapes of things supernal'. He has described the ecstasies and the terrors of a wild outburst of Asiatic religious fervor; and, now that he is ending his play and nearing the end of his own life, he says, in effect, "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, Than are dreamt of in your philosophy". So with Plato's Phaedo here. A solemn music has reached its sad but fortifying close. An upright man has nobly met an unjust death. "*Iustum et tenacem propositi virum*": that was to be the final verdict of history. Wise he was and Socrates the Sage he might well be called: *ἀνδρῶν ἀπάντων Σωκράτης σοφώτατος*, 'Of all men Socrates the wisest is'. Good he was, and one day to be numbered with the Saints: "Sancte Socrates, ora pro nobis": 'Saint Socrates, pray for us'. But above all, he was, in the mind of Plato, who knew him best, and knew all too well that in free Athens the law as there dispensed had awarded to him the penalty reserved by civilized peoples for the worst of criminals, in the mind of Plato he was Socrates the Just: 'This was the end, Echecrates, of our companion, a man who, among those of his day whom we have known, was—we may say—the best, the wisest too and the most just'.

PEACEHAVEN,
SUSSEX, ENGLAND

W. RHYS ROBERTS

The Influence of Latin on the Spelling of English words.

By Warren W. Coxe, Chief, Bureau of Educational Measurements, State Department of Education, New York. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co. (1924). Pp. 121.

Mr. Coxe's monograph, *The Influence of Latin on the Spelling of English Words*, should have been entitled *The Influence of the Study of Latin on Success in the Spelling of English Words*. It is a product of a part of the investigation of the teaching of the classical languages that was sponsored by the American Classical League.

While studies have been made in this field, nothing of certain validity was previously accomplished. The investigator had first to devise lists of words of equal difficulty, composed of words of Latin origin and words of non-Latin origin in definite proportions; he had then to secure the cooperation of the Schools, and to evaluate the differences in the intelligence of the students entering the tests, or else to eliminate

these differences by the manner of evaluating the results of the tests.

The students were divided into five groups, three of pupils studying Latin, two of pupils not studying Latin. With these groups the procedure was as follows. Group 1: the teacher of Latin was to avoid any attempt to relate the spelling of the Latin words to that of the English words; Group 2: the teacher of Latin was instructed to point out in an incidental way the resemblances in spelling between the Latin words studied and the English derivatives; Group 3: the teacher of Latin was to point out such similarities and to teach certain definite rules or principles involved; Group 4: no special effort was made to teach English spelling, other than that required by the rules of the School; Group 5: the English teacher followed the best current practice in the teaching of English spelling.

The results of all the comparisons show that the study of Latin does improve the pupils' spelling of English words of Latin origin, though the difference is sometimes only slightly greater than that obtained by the best methods of teaching English spelling; that the study of Latin sometimes interferes slightly with the pupils' spelling of English words of non-Latin origin; that the best results were obtained with the pupils of Group 3, closely followed by those gained with Group 2; that the gain was most pronounced in the first year of Latin, and did not continue at the same rate, if indeed it continued at all, during the succeeding years. The lesson is, of course, that the method used with Group 3 should be adopted with all pupils.

The ordinary reader of this monograph, however interested he may be, is likely to become hopelessly and helplessly bogged in a swamp of mathematical tables, the precise significance of which is utterly dark to the uninitiate. Granted that such an advantage does exist in favor of students of Latin, how great is it? In order to get intelligible results, I have made some calculations on the basis of Tables IX and X, on pages 58 and 59 (I cannot guarantee that I have done the work rightly, but I have done my best).

Table IX.—1510 students of Latin, in the Ninth Grade, just before beginning Latin, spelled correctly, on an average, 40.1 words out of 100 of Latin origin; 1566 students not taking Latin spelled correctly 34.8 words. After one semester, the two groups averaged 58.4 and 49.0 respectively. The students of Latin gained 18.3 words per hundred, nearly 45%; the other students gained 14.2 words per hundred, a trifle over 40%. The advantage in favor of the students of Latin was thus 4.1 words per hundred. Be it noted that in the actual tests but ten words were used: I have therefore multiplied by 10 to make Mr. Coxe's figures convey a fair impression to the mind.

Table X.—1267 students about to begin Latin in the Ninth Grade averaged 44.8 words correctly spelled, out of 100 (I have again multiplied by 10); 1157 not planning to study Latin averaged 36.8 words correctly spelled. At the end of the year, the figures were 67.7 and 54.6 respectively. The students of Latin thus gained 23.4 words per hundred, over 50%; the

other students gained 17.8 words per hundred, not quite 50%. The advantage in favor of the students of Latin was thus 5.6 words per hundred.

An interesting point is made in the last paragraph of page 110, that the differences in achievement are shown more clearly when the influence of intelligence is eliminated, and that, therefore, there is no foundation for the current belief that the superiority of Latin pupils is due to greater natural intelligence. Mr. Coxe's conclusion, if it can be reenforced by other similar experiments, will be extremely heartening to the advocates of the Classics.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

ROLAND G. KENT

The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter. A Study in Greek Epistolography. By Francis Xavier J. Exler. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America (1923). Pp. 141.

The Reverend Mr. Exler, in the Preface (11-12) to his dissertation on The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter, expresses a regret which will arouse sympathy in any one who has struggled to produce a dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. He had intended to investigate the origin of the Greek letter-form, basing the study exclusively on the examination of the papyri. Unfortunately, the material at hand proved insufficient to "warrant any conclusions concerning the origin of the Greek epistolary form". The original purpose of the dissertation, therefore, had to be abandoned. What Dr. Exler has done is to collect from the papyri opening and closing formulas used in letters, formulas for dating letters, and conventional phrases employed in the body of the letter. These are arranged by types. Within the type the instances are presented in chronological order. As a scholarly piece of work, the dissertation immediately challenges comparison with the dissertation of F. Ziemann, *De Epistularum Graecarum Formulis Sollemnibus Quaestiones Selectae* (Halle, 1911). Dr. Exler has less theorizing than Dr. Ziemann, but his presentation of material is far superior. He has arranged his facts in such a way that a papyrologist may easily find relevant material; for this purpose Dr. Ziemann's work is practically useless.

Since the chief value of this dissertation lies in a presentation of statistics, it is a pity that they are not complete. It would have been impracticable, and scarcely useful, to quote every example of every formula, but it would have been advisable to give references to every occurrence, and to set down the exact number of times that the different formulas occur, that the reader might draw his own conclusions. As

it is, in the case of the formulas which occur in great numbers, Dr. Exler has given, he says (13), enough examples "to show the relative frequency of their occurrence". Probably all practical ends are served by this method, but one cannot help feeling that, if we are to have statistics, they should be complete.

Statistics should also be accurate. Here, lest any misunderstanding arise, let it be premised that the task of assembling the material and reading the proof of the lists with the hundreds of examples and references to collections of papyri is enough to try the patience and the skill of the stoutest scholar. It is no reflection on Dr. Exler's ability to say that his work is by no means impeccable. An examination of sixteen examples taken at random revealed five errors. On page 44, under "P. Hib. 72 (222)", for Δωρίωνι ἐπιστάτην παρὰ Περσίου ἀρχιερέως read ὑπόμνημα. Δωρίωνι. . . . On page 51, under "P. Hib. I 102 (276)", for Κυρηναῖος τῶν Ζωίδου ιδιώτης Εὐκάρπῳ ἰατρῷ χαλεπὸν read . . . Κυρηναῖος . . . Κυρηναῖος is an adjective, not a proper name.

Dr. Exler has omitted brackets in quoting fragmentary texts, a procedure which for such a work is advisable in general, but sometimes may cause confusion. For instance, if on page 52 under "P. Tebt. I, 32 (124) d", Σῶσις for [Σῶσις], the reading of the edition of P. Tebt. (restored from Σῶσου in a companion letter) is not a misprint, it needs a note of explanation. On page 52, for "P. Tebt. I 37 (33)" read 'P. Tebt. I 37 (133)'. On page 58, for "P. S. I. 326 (65)" read 'P. S. I. 326 (IV. 65)'.

Among other errors, found in the commentary and in the summaries and so more likely to mislead the reader, is the statement on page 61 that the formula "To B—A—χαλεπὸν" is found from the second century of our era to the third. But on page 58 an example is cited from a papyrus dated in 261 B. C. On page 66 it is stated that "All documents with <the> formula <To B—χαλεπὸν A—now extant belong to the early Ptolemaic period", whereas on page 43 examples are cited extending as far down as B. C. 99. On page 122 it is more correctly stated that this formula is found during the Ptolemaic period only.

However, these errors, unfortunate as they may be, do not render the author's labors fruitless. His chief service lies in having assembled a multitude of citations (apparently accurate in all essential particulars), and in having classified them so that scholars can use them in interpreting new material as it may be published.

YALE UNIVERSITY

HARRY M. HUBBELL.

¹"P. Hib." = B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Hibek Papyri*, I (London, 1906).